

REMARKS

The Examiner applies a new combination of references – namely Barnard in view of newly cited Aschenbrenner in rejecting claims 46-55 and 57-61 under 35 U.S.C. §103. Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Barnard in view of Aschenbrenner further in view of Official Notice.

Claim 48 recites in said printer or copier first and second control units and a second control unit having a data object stored in the storage region thereof where that data object comprises a parameter for control of the printer or copier which is not controllable from the control panel of the printer. The primary reference Barnard only teaches a network management computer 20 in Figs. 1 and 9 for controlling printers or servers connected to the management computer in a network. There is no discussion of a first and second control unit inside the printer in Barnard. Barnard also has no discussion of a parameter for control of the printer or copier as a data object of the second control unit.

Aschenbrenner has nothing to do with a data object which comprises a parameter for control of the printer or copier. Aschenbrenner only deals with raster objects which are part of a document data stream. A parameter for control of the printer or copier has nothing to do with a raster object of a document data stream. Therefore, both Barnard and Aschenbrenner are not relevant to the invention claimed in claim 46.

As Aschenbrenner discloses at column 1, lines 13-38, what is involved is image data for a bit mapped image where a raster image processor performs various operations to generate the raster bit map to print the image. The Examiner cites Aschenbrenner column 7, line 1 through column 8, line 53. But this entire disclosure only relates to raster objects which are the print data which has nothing to do with a

data object comprising a parameter for control of the printer or copier where that data object is not controllable from the control panel of the printer. Print stream data, on the other hand, are controllable from the control panel of the printer. Thus Aschenbrenner has no relevance for this reason also.

As to Barnard, the Examiner relies on Figure 9 and column 6, lines 25-54 of Barnard for Applicants' claim 46 recitation of first and second control units which, in the words of claim 46, are in said printer or copier. But Figure 9 of Barnard only shows a network management device 20 connected to a network having a server 14 also connected thereto. But nowhere is there shown in Figure 9 the first and second control units inside the server 14. In column 6, lines 25-54 only discuss what is shown in Figure 1 namely the network management device 20 connected to printers and print servers on the network. There is no showing of any first and second control unit inside the printer, and clearly no parameter for control of the printer as a data object for the second control unit.

There are other differences between claim 46 and Aschenbrenner and Barnard. Claim 46 recites a first network address with the first control unit, a second network address with the second control unit, and a third network address different than the second network address for the data object having the parameter for control of the printer. But Barnard only has addresses for different isolated printers on the network shown in Fig. 1 but no disclosure of control units within a printer having addresses and certainly no address for the data object parameter for control of that printer having the first and second control units therein. IP addresses on a network for different printers has nothing to do with the addresses cited in claim 46 relating to first and second control units within a printer.

Aschenbrenner also discloses nothing about the recited addresses in claim 46 since Aschenbrenner does not disclose network addresses. Aschenbrenner only teaches about memory addresses for the print data stream raster objects – see Fig. 5A, 100 and 102; column 7, lines 5-8, and column 8, lines 1-2.

Aschenbrenner's assignment of memory is not to enable a simplified direct address by an external control unit but just a regular memory address for access of the print – internal image data processor.

Aschenbrenner's memory address is not for maintenance, adjustment, or error analysis of the raster data object but for reading data out of the memory.

Aschenbrenner's memory addresses are assigned in serial fashion object-by-object in order to process the objects serially within the document data stream- see Figures 1, 5A and 5B.

There is no teaching about details how to assign network addresses to control units and data objects. Aschenbrenner just mentions a hardware PCI bus card as a data interface for print data including raster objects at column 1, lines 41-47.

At page 9 of the Office Action, first full paragraph, the Examiner suggests that there may be language focusing on the connection between the control units and the data objects, referring to Substitute Specification pages 3 and 4. Applicants are willing to discuss with the Examiner additions to the claims but Applicants also firmly believe that the claims already distinguish readily over the cited references as enumerated above.

Dependent claims 47-58 and 60 distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 46 and also by reciting additional features not suggested.

System claim 61 distinguishes in a manner noted with respect to claim 46.

Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg.No.27,841)

Brett A. Valiquet
Schiff Hardin LLP
Patent Department
Suite 6600
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 258-5786
Attorneys for Applicants.
CUSTOMER NO. 26574

CH2\7604874.1